

Show it Again and Again and Again and...

An Exploration of Vital Materiality in *Headroom* through Repetition and Difference

by

Job Sijtsma

MA Thesis – Contemporary Theatre, Dance, and Dramaturgy

Supervisor: Dr. Chiel Kattenbelt – Dep. Media and Culture

Second reader: Dr. Laura Karreman – Dep. Media and culture

15 August 2019

Abstract

This research assumes the concept of repetition and difference taken from Gilles Deleuze's writing as a dramaturgical tool for theatre and performance to analyse the performance *Headroom* (2018). It reveals certain qualities of repetition and tries to connect these qualities to the field of new materialism, which stresses the importance of post-anthropocentric thought and the idea of agential matter. These ideas are found to be connected to Deleuze's theory about the actual and the virtual and the analysis of *Headroom* shows that repetition and difference could indeed be used to open up the awareness of the audience towards new materialist thought. The repetition and difference in lighting and sound emphasize the tendencies of humans to look for routine, making these often invisible patterns visible. The relation between the performer's bodies and the objects on stage are shifted to more equal levels than usual in theatre and performance because of repetition and difference as well. Through this, things acquire agency in and are an active part of the composition, forming the assemblage of the performance. In a further analysis, the actual and the virtual are explored as connected and the sensations and experience of the audience is found to be often caused by the physical thing-power of objects in *Headroom* that are shown with the use of repetition and difference. In a comparison with other media that incorporate repetition, it is found that the specific qualities of liveness and presence of the theatre experience fits best with the use of repetition and difference to focus on vital materiality.

Table of Contents

Introduction	p. 4
Chapter 1 – Repetition and Difference as Dramaturgical Tool	p. 7
Dramaturgy of the Here and Now	p. 7
Qualities of Repetition	p. 8
Repetition and New Materialism	p. 10
Chapter 2	p. 12
Actual and Virtual	p. 12
Lighting and Soundscape	p. 13
Bodies and Objects	p. 15
A Compositional Assemblage	p. 19
Chapter 3	p. 20
Sense-Making through Repetition and Difference	p. 20
Experiencing Vital Materiality on Stage	p. 21
Problematic Representation	p. 24
Chapter 4 – Repetition in other Media Formats	p. 27
Repetition in Film	p. 27
Repetition in Beckett’s Literature and Theatre	p. 29
Conclusion	p. 30
Bibliography	p. 33

“Cause we are living in a material world, and I am a material girl.”¹

Introduction

For certain scholars in today’s world, Madonna hits the nail on the head with the above lyric, even though her idea of a material world has to do more with possessions than with the ideas coming from a field of study called new materialism. According to new materialist thought, we are indeed living in a material world, and we are material just as much as the spoon, mandarin, box of tea, or crumpled up tissue that are lying on my desk right now. This awareness towards non-human matter moves together with the concept of a post-anthropocentric world in which the human is not the centre of the world and certainly not the centre of the universe. On a social and political level, these ideas are meant to open individual’s eyes about topics like the environment, power-positions within political structures, and the future of the world in general. For example, the idea of agential matter Jane Bennett describes in her book *Vibrant Matter*, which means that any object or organic matter has agency and can thus have influence on something in this world, could be a step towards seeing new materialism as a new, improved environmental awareness.² What Bennett calls “vital materiality” is an important concept for individuals to become aware of, as it could move them towards a better understanding of what affects them and how they affect the world. In short, new materialism could make people in a world that is primarily individualised and self-centred, realise that our actions have consequences and that *things* perform actions as well, even when we do not notice it.

In theatre, dance, and performance, the materiality of things and human bodies has become a theme that is explored through different dramaturgical choices. Objects are given important roles in performance, for example in *All Things Want To Run* (2019) by Anthony Nestel and Esther Arribas, in which two performers manipulate a huge cube object made of steel pipes. The longer the performance takes, the more it seems that the object takes over this manipulation, leading the performers in their movements. Materiality and structure of the body is explored in *Ghost Writer And The Broken Hand Break* (2019) by Miet Warlop, in which the performers continuously spin around like the active meditation form of Sufi whirling. The repetition of this movement is meant to provide the audience with an experience in which the structure and intensity of the whirling can be explored in intricate detail. In performance, repetition can be used in such a way that it reveals the structure or method behind something, which can affect the perception of the spectator. According to Eirini Kartsaki, repetition in performance moves beyond representation as it does not try to depict

¹ Madonna, *Material Girl*, 1984, Song, 1984.

² Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), <http://www.dawsonera.com/depp/reader/protected/external/AbstractView/S9780822391623>.

something, but tries to affect the audience directly, possibly redefining their knowledge or their awareness towards something.³ For new materialism, obtaining an open awareness to vital materiality is important for any individual, which is why this research will attempt to explore this concept as a dramaturgical tool for performance, to find what qualities repetition has, how it can be used and to what effect for the performance and the audience. This exploration will be done through the analysis of a performance by Boogaerdt/VanderSchoot and Erik Whien, all makers at Theater Rotterdam, called *Headroom* (2018). This is a visual, non-textual performance that is structured around the use of light and dark and the restriction of the theatre space, resulting in a presentation of many tableaux vivants. These tableaux consist of various regular and irregular objects and five human performers using prosthetic masks, all put into composition together. The repetition of light and dark, objects, sound and how these repetitions relate to the human bodies on stage and in the audience will be used to exemplify how repetition as a dramaturgical tool and its qualities can emphasize new materialist thought.

The theoretical framework that will be used to contextualise repetition as a dramaturgical tool consists of performance theory on dramaturgy and theories on repetition in performance and in other contexts. *Dramaturgy and Performance*, by Turner and Behrndt, together with *The Practice of Dramaturgy* by Konstantina Georgelou and others, will be used as sources on what dramaturgy does in contemporary performance, as both are recent sources which have moved on from the classic definitions of dramaturgy that are often outdated. Hans-Thies Lehmann's texts on theatre and dramaturgy will also be used for that and also to discuss presence in theatre, which is closely linked to repetition and the experience of the audience. For this, Cormac Power's *Presence in Play* will be incorporated as well, as it gives a thorough overview of the different possible modes of presence. On repetition in performance, Eirini Kartsaki was already mentioned in this introduction, as her book is one of the few texts specifically considering repetition in theatre and performance in such detailed style, especially on the topic of the spectator's experience. The source that has become the basis and the glue of this research is *Difference and Repetition*, by Gilles Deleuze, is a philosophical journey of a book that explores the concepts of repetition and difference which he connects to ideas that are close to those of new materialism. As Deleuze states that difference is inherent within repetition, I have taken both together as a dramaturgical tool to analyse the performance.⁴ To help understand his ideas and to be capable of a critical look into this book, I use James Williams' critical reading, which gives detailed insight into Deleuze's ideas. Two important concepts *Difference and Repetition* focuses on are the virtual and the material. The virtual, according to Power's definitions of presence,

³ Eirini Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance: Returns and Invisible Forces*, 1 online resource : illustrations vols (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2017), <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=4984143>.

⁴ Gilles Deleuze and Paul Patton, *Difference and Repetition* (London: Athlone Press, 1994).

has moved away from a spiritual quality to actual forces of life that do not have auratic but real presence.⁵ So, the theory in Deleuze's writing can be used to explore these forces of things and bodies in the performance *Headroom*, to find how repetition and difference might open up the awareness of the audience towards vital materiality. For theory on new materialism, I started from Jane Bennett's writing and found a book by Rick Dolphijn and Iris van der Tuin that compiles leading scholars within the field of new materialism together, which lead to source material from Manuel DeLanda, who connects new materialism to some of Deleuze's ideas, and Rosi Braidotti, who focuses on posthuman ideas. Next to that I used Rebecca Schneider's text concerning new materialism in performance, as it contains helpful observations for analysing a performance from a new materialist perspective.

Next to this theoretical framework, I take the concept of the dramaturgical tool playfully serious, which is why I have come up with definitions of the use of repetition and difference to give it defined distinctions that could be used in practice and theory. Repetitions in *Headroom* will be divided into two categories: qualitative and quantitative, derived from Henri Bergson's ideas about multiplicities in which he divided them in continuous and discrete multiplicities, in which both categories had distinctive features, mostly opposing each other. A continuous multiplicity, for example, divides by changing in kind and a discrete multiplicity divides without changing. On top of that, a continuous multiplicity is concerned with the qualitative and durational, a discrete multiplicity with the quantitative and the spatial.⁶ Both space and time are obvious factors in the process of dissecting repetition and difference as a dramaturgical tool, which led to the idea of qualitative repetition with similar features as a continuous multiplicity and quantitative repetition with similar features as the discrete. For example, try snapping your fingers with both your hands at the same time. The result is a repetition not over time, as it happens in the same moment, but over space. The movement shows as a copy of itself in both hands, making it a quantitative repetition. Now snap your fingers with one of your hands a couple of times. Here, duration is what signifies these movements as repetition, and it can be classified as qualitative. Of course these qualities of repetition and difference are not necessarily specific to the theatre format, which is why the analysis will lead into an exploration of the media of film and literature, meant to contextualise the findings from the analysis and to find what qualities of repetition and difference are specific or most effective in contemporary performance.

⁵ Cormac Power, *Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre* (New York: Rodolpi, 2008).

⁶ Henri Bergson, *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness* (Courier Corporation, 2012).

Chapter 1 – Repetition and Difference as Dramaturgical Tool

Dramaturgy of the Here and Now

The ‘dramaturgical tool’ is a term that fits perfectly within the expertise of the dramaturg: Imagine a handyman with a toolbox, but replace all regular tools with concepts, ideas, and practical knowledge meant to shape a performance or choreography to its best potential and bridging gaps between theory and practice.⁷ This bridging does not occur only within the field of performance, but also extends to other theoretical and practical fields. Over the years, interdisciplinarity has become a demanding concept⁸ and contemporary theatre concerns itself with topics from various field, which is partly why theatre makers and scholars are now looking for concepts and processes in fields outside of the arts, outside of ‘the box’. Through this transdisciplinary way of working, concepts that are not art, can be presented as if they were art, and art can be presented as something other than art.⁹ The borders that conventionally existed between the arts and other fields are blurred, opening up the potential for dramaturgical research to expand the toolbox of the dramaturg. However, the dramaturgical choices made for a performance have consequences, as they are visible on stage and influence the audience. Dramaturgy, through the bridging of theory and practice, focuses on aspects of performance that are meant for sense-making, or to provide context.¹⁰ So, it is important to play around with the concepts and ideas (the tools) that can be used on stage, but the purpose of these ideas needs to be clear for the dramaturg and for everyone involved in making a performance. A tool has to be useful, which in this case means it has to present something that has the relevancy to be shown to an audience, and to be interpreted by that audience, to create a meaningful experience. A theatre audience cannot collectively attach the same meaning to a performance they watch, as meaning-making is an individual experience. The spectator can be assumed to create meaning and the dramaturgy will have intended certain experiences, but in an analysis like this, a definite claim cannot be made. They are experiencing one thing collectively, however: the sharing of a space. Moreover, they share the space also with the performers and everything else present. “Visual dramaturgy”, is what Hans-Thies Lehmann calls a focus on the space of the theatre in *Postdramatic Theatre*, often mentioned along with the practice of scenography.¹¹ Meaning is created through the

⁷ Bojana Bauer, ‘Propensity: Pragmatics and Functions of Dramaturgy in Contemporary Dance’, in *Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement*, ed. Pil Hansen and Darcey Callison, New World Choreographies (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015), 31–50, https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137373229_2.

⁸ Konstantina Georgelou, NITE interdisciplinary event, Panel discussion, 25 April 2019.

⁹ Elke van Campenhout and Lilia Mestre, *Turn, Turtle!: Reenacting The Institute* (Alexander Verlag Berlin, 2016).

¹⁰ Konstantina Georgelou, Efrosini Protopapa, and Danae Theodoridou, *The Practice of Dramaturgy: Working on Actions in Performance*, Arts in Society (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2017).

¹¹ Hans-Thies Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*, 2006.

collective sharing of the experience, which connects to the importance of the liveness of theatre, where everything happens in the here and now.

Such an awareness of the 'now' and the liveness of theatre has been prominent since the start of the 21st Century, resulting in the idea of theatrical presence being discussed and explored in both theory and practice.¹² Presence is a difficult notion to grasp concretely, because it is often used to describe a feeling that seems transcendental. *I felt a presence in the room.* Someone can *have* presence because of their charisma or attitude, which Cormac Power calls "the auratic mode of presence."¹³ *Being* present is a more tangible concept, as it describes physical bodies being in a space. Such togetherness that occurs at a performance is a specific quality reserved for the format of theatre, as the reception of the audience and the performing done by the performers are a real act happening in the here and now. It is a moment of time where the aesthetic act and real life meet at a crossroads.¹⁴ In this shared space, meaning-making occurs which can linger when the spectators exit the space, because they have shared a unique moment together. Moments like that also happen in actual daily life, and it seems to be theatre that can provide a heightened awareness to notice them because of these lingering experiences. This is why dramaturgical tools used in theatre and performance can have an effect on a person's daily life, thoughts, and maybe even their behaviour.

Qualities of Repetition

One of these dramaturgical tools is called repetition, which can be defined as "the act or an instance of repeating or being repeated."¹⁵ Various ideas can be linked to the notion of repetition, because it is a concept that seems to occur a lot on this planet and in our daily lives. We go to bed, we wake up. We go to bed, we wake up. A group of elephants migrates to find water. They find water. The same group migrates next year to find water. They find it. A 4/4 drumbeat lasts for four counts and then repeats. In nature, fractals exist in many forms: you can find a Romanesco broccoli in the supermarket or look it up online, and it is easy to discover how its structure repeats itself within itself. Next to these examples of repetition, repetition occurs in performance and dance enough to have a book written about it. Eirini Kartsaki, in *Repetition and Performance*, discusses what repetition is, what it can do in performance, and her personal experiences that reflect on the experience of the spectator.¹⁶ This part of the chapter will briefly go into her findings and experiences to provide a solid

¹² Cathy Turner and Synne K. Behrndt, *Dramaturgy and Performance*, Revised edition., Theatre and Performance Practices (London: Palgrave, 2016).

¹³ Power, *Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre*.

¹⁴ Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*.

¹⁵ 'Repetition | Definition of Repetition by Merriam-Webster', accessed 14 July 2019, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/repetition>.

¹⁶ Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

structure of repetition's relevance within contemporary performance, while also reflecting on these findings with new examples and ideas.

Kartsaki describes that when a specific movement in a dance is performed again and again over time, a qualitative repetition, it draws the attention more towards the details of the movement and the body exercising it. So, as a dramaturgical tool, repetition can be used to make the body more like a sculpture. Through this tool, the spectator can focus on how the body shapes itself, as if looking at a living statue to see where the muscles contract and how the balance is kept.¹⁷ During an internship at Vlaams Cultuurhuis de Brakke Grond in Amsterdam, I watched a dancer, Moreno Perna, perform a first draft of his piece called *Aura* (2019) which contained a movement that was repeated many times. He would place both feet firm on the ground and bring his right arm from behind his body to the front, at the height of his hip, with his fingers spread as if pushing something forward. This he would then also do with his left arm, and the movement repeated in multiple sequences. I noticed that the first time I saw the movement, it signified something sexual and provocative which seemed not fitting with the rest of the choreography. However, when it was repeated it made place for other experiences as the movement was transformed by the repetitions. My focus shifted from the movement as a signifier for something to a doorway of exploring details: the legs placed strongly on the ground, the face that lost all tension while the arm moved forward, the shaking of the fingers. His body had become a sculpture and the movement's relevance was not in the gesture, but in the structure. On top of that, every time his hands pushed forward, my own body was activated as if the air pushed forward by Moreno arrived at me and pushed me backwards. Eirini Kartsaki describes a similar physical experience and explains that repetition used like this is not a tool for representation and signs, but for the experience of sensations and the activation of the spectator's body.¹⁸ Something that is usually routine, like opening and closing the mouth, becomes a painful exercise when doing it for an hour. The body hurts and contorts to consciously try and relieve the pain. Repetition can have strong physical effects on the audience as the invisible is made visible and physically noticeable, which can have a feeling of uneasiness on the spectator.¹⁹

It is clear that repetition can allow a viewer to notice the details and structure of movement in performance, but when applied in different contexts it can cause other effects. In *Dying Together*, a participatory performance by Lotte van den Berg, every scene is made up of what they call a "constellation."²⁰ At the start of each of these constellations, a heavy stone is moved by four performers who then place it at a different point in the space. Here, the repeated movement in itself

¹⁷ Kartsaki.

¹⁸ Kartsaki.

¹⁹ Kartsaki.

²⁰ 'DYING TOGETHER', *Third Space* (blog), accessed 16 July 2019, <https://www.thirdspace.nl/werk/dying-together/>.

does not activate the audience necessarily, but it is part of a recognizable structure of the performance. The spectator will understand that, every time the stone is moved, a new constellation will start and, through this gesture, the structure of the performance is formed to be understood by the audience. This means that repetition can be used to provide a specific structure to the narrative and to a performance itself, by returning to a point the piece had already visited. According to Kartsaki, repetition often evokes the idea of returning, which is also a relevant aspect of the postmodern arts, where one wants to return to what is old or known, to try and subvert the base on which the familiar is built.²¹ In this sense, repetition can be a tool for breaking rules and for playing with existing conventions of culture and of theatre. Next to that, repetition in performance seems to also move beyond representation and narrative, a key aspect of contemporary performance, which means that performances are more concerned with what is present on stage and the presence of what is shown.²² This presence is often easily linked to the spiritual or, as Cormac Power describes, auratic.²³ However, Gilles Deleuze, in his book on Francis Bacon, says that “for a sensation to exist, a force must be exerted on the body.”²⁴ This is again reflected in *Repetition and Difference*, as he explicitly mentions to be against the idea of essences, while arguing for the physical force of things and bodies.²⁵ The notion of essence can be linked to the spiritual and the auratic, as they all exist on a transcendental plane of concepts that cannot be grasped concretely. So, when separating the auratic from Power’s notion of presence, we are left with physically being present, as thing or as body. The sensations caused by using repetition as a dramaturgical tool should thus be seen as sensations caused by physical, material things that have a certain power over the spectator.

Repetition and New Materialism

The claims that things and objects can have a certain power or agency over other things or humans, and that a material world exists outside of our minds, are important concepts for scholars exploring the field of new materialism. Jane Bennett mentions the inherent force of materiality as opposed to spirituality²⁶ and Manuel DeLanda introduces the concept of processes to get rid of the idea of essence, by showing that the autonomous material world that has an actual effect on the human mind and body, is not something spiritual, but something real.²⁷ The actual also comes forward in

²¹ Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

²² Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*.

²³ Power, *Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre*.

²⁴ Gilles Deleuze and Francis Bacon, *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation* (London; New York: Continuum, 2004).

²⁵ Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

²⁶ Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

²⁷ European Graduate School Video Lectures, *Manuel DeLanda. Deleuze and The New Materialism. 2009.*, accessed 13 November 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EcqRGy9T32c>.

Deleuze's book about repetition and difference, where he distinguishes two concepts: the actual and the virtual. The actual is what *is*, the materiality of a thing, while the virtual is described as the intensities and sensations projected onto it by individuals.²⁸ In a critical reading of this text, James Williams explains it through the example of a coconut: The coconut is a hard object, which belongs to the actual. On top of that, the hardness of this object also carries with it the intensity of all other hard things, through the sensation of feeling this hardness.²⁹ This is the virtual, which, opposed to the material, exists in the mind of the human. It is similar to the idea of signs in theatre, where an object is on stage as the actual object it is, but also as what it virtually signifies for the spectator. The notion of repetition and difference is then used by Deleuze to support his claim that reality is made up out of the actual and the virtual. However, it is important to understand that the virtual should not be equated with transcendental concepts like essence and spirituality. Even though the virtual is about the sensations and intensities perceived by the mind, these are all caused by the actual force of things, which is why Deleuze's ideas connect so well with new materialist thought.

It is evident that through the use of repetition as a dramaturgical tool, the structure of a performance can be emphasized because the repetition allows the spectator to focus on details. This is also how the movements of a performer can be explored, which shifts the idea of theatre from representation towards something else, as the focal point is not what the movement means or represents, but what its structure is and what it does to performer and audience. The relationship between them in the shared space of the performance is also of importance in this case. What exactly repetition does to the audience is described by Kartsaki as a very physical sensation through which the body is activated, which is reflected in the experiences I had as well. Sensations are caused by the presence of things and bodies on stage, effects that are not auratic or spiritual, but real physical forces. The fact that something is present is exemplified by repetition, which causes this presence to have an effect. This connects repetition to the field of new materialism, in which the idea of vital materiality and the force of things is a leading thought that separates mind from the material world. Deleuze calls this separation the actual and the virtual, for which his notion of repetition and difference is a way to explore the idea of reality as actual/virtual. So, it makes sense to explore a performance that uses repetition, in this case *Headroom*, through the lens of this notion, as a method of discussing the materiality of things and bodies and to find out how the actual and the virtual can be reflected on stage.

²⁸ Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

²⁹ James Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: A Critical Introduction and Guide* (Edinburgh, UNITED KINGDOM: Edinburgh University Press, 2013), <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=1126583>.

Chapter 2 – Finding the Actual in *Headroom*: Thing-Power through Repetition and Difference

Actual and Virtual

It is assumed in this research that the world consists of the actual and the virtual, which means that the performance *Headroom* could be divided up into two parts that discuss them separately. Realistically, that is not fully possible, as these concepts are intertwined in how they relate and affect each other. Deleuze does try to distinguish actual differences from what he calls “pure differences”, which are immaterial differences, but also acknowledges the relationship between the two, as he claims that actual things alter or can be altered because of their relation to pure difference, which is part of the virtual.³⁰ In *New Materialisms: Interviews and Cartographies*, a similar point is made which simplifies the relation between actual and virtual to understanding that matter and meaning are entangled, even though they are separate processes.³¹ In the theatre format, this can translate to the actual physical presence of performers and spectator who share the physical space in the here and now, and the meaning, sensations, and intensities produced by this encounter. Because I focus the research on a performance analysis of *Headroom*, the separation of these two notions seems like a potential way of adding a clearer structure for the reader. When first exploring both aspects separately through the use of repetition and difference, it can emphasize on the materiality of the performance before meaning-making has occurred. The vital materiality Bennett describes is not about what the human mind makes of it, but about that physical real force, which means that the significance of something comes before understanding.³² On top of that, because Deleuze tries to distinguish the actual from the virtual in repetition and difference, the research will reflect this strategy and potentially reveal interesting findings on how they can be distinguished in performance and daily life.

Lighting and Soundscape

Everything in the performance *Headroom* starts and ends with two main components: the use of lighting and the soundscape, which was made by Wessel Schrik. As dramaturgical choices, both have to be explored separately and together as they influence each other, but also have similarities and differences that are relevant to discover. The performance starts with a stage full of ‘stuff’ in front of

³⁰ Williams.

³¹ Iris Van der Tuin and Rick Dolphijn, *New Materialism: Interviews & Cartographies* (Open Humanities Press, 2012).

³² Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

which curtains are slowly being pulled up, hiding all the visible on stage and after that the space is fully dark. The soundscape starts playing, and for a solid five minutes, the rhythmical but tonal sounds of a gamelan are the only thing filling the darkness. After that, a spotlight turns on, shining its yellow light on a square of maybe four by four, which contains something. That something will be discussed later and will be unknown for now, as to support the separation of actual and virtual, so the reader for now has space to not interpret. 20 seconds later, the stage turns dark again. 15 or so seconds later, the light turns on again, showing something. This continues until the end of the performance, which leaves the audience in the dark again. This is an example of what I call equivalent repetition as it repeats a situation over and over, in which the only way to distinguish that it is indeed a repetition, is the continuity of it, the fact that time passes in between the moments.³³ In *Headroom*, it creates a certain rhythm for the performance which is not just as simple as 'on-off-on-off' because there are differences throughout that interrupt this rhythm. Interruption is named next to difference and repetition by Kartsaki because within every repeated something, there is a rupture, a gap that is part of the repetition but seems to be without anything.³⁴ Here, that gap is emphasized by the repeated darkness. It is a no-thing³⁵, it stands on its own as it creates a situation, but it is difficult to define it as something. It can be described as an actant impacting the moment every time the light turns off, as Latour describes the actant as "any entity that modifies another entity in a trial"³⁶. This modification means the light turning off, the darkness as no-thing, has agency in this situation.

Through this thought process, it seems that the interruption is closely connected to the notion of difference, and that this difference is what gives the repeated darkness agency. On top of that, it is not only the repeated darkness itself that provides this interruption. There are two moments throughout the performance where the light turns on again, but instead of a soft yellow light, a bright white light shines on the stage. The first time this happens, the series of repetitions before this are interrupted by a change, which suddenly reminds the spectator of the pattern that was created until this point. Here it shows how difficult but relevant it is to separate the actual from the virtual: it is impossible not to include the spectator in this part of the analysis, as the understanding of the virtual is needed to explain the actual. A series of repetitions is actually never a repetition of the exact same³⁷, and the series of on-off-on-off defined by the spectator and by me as

³³ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*.

³⁴ Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

³⁵ Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

³⁶ Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford, UNITED KINGDOM: Oxford University Press USA - OSO, 2005),

<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=422646>.

³⁷ Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

repetition is always different, it technically contains *only* difference. The relevance of discussing the spectator here is that we as humans tend to focus on “the continuity afforded by the variation of an idea or an intensity”³⁸, which means a person will connect to a pattern and find this pattern even in its differences. In *Headroom*, the actual shown on stage is a different something every time the light goes on. This difference can then be registered by the spectator, but the repetition evokes the idea of return, of structure, which for the audience creates meaning.³⁹ Another example of this is when two large, heavy-looking stones are seen in the lit-up square. They have a clear material presence, and when the light goes off, it is off for a noticeably longer time than usual. Again, interruption of the pattern, but this time the meaning-making connects it to the intensity of the objects seen on stage before this. They were heavy and big, and this intensity fits perfectly with a difference in time of darkness, it still makes sense. The repetition of light and dark present repetition to the audience, and the interruptions exemplify that difference is part of repetition on the actual level, while we tend to make meaning through the repetitions/differences on the virtual level.

The soundscape, which continues constantly until just before the end, also includes interruptions within, but it is the repetition and difference itself in the first five minutes of the performance that perform a quality of this notion that has not been explored yet. Next to that, the combination of the soundscape and the lighting during the rest of the performance also shows certain aspects of repetition and difference that will be discussed. The first part in complete darkness is filled by the sounds of a gamelan, which is an Indonesian percussive instrument consisting of many different tonal components. Rhythmic tones are intertwined and as some become louder, other tones fade into the background, and through this slow progression a completely new section is played. Gertrude Stein, in one of her texts, explains the term “continuous present”, which is the sensation of being in this present continuously because of the multiple things happening all at once, flowing into each other, removing the idea of a ‘next moment.’⁴⁰ This is exactly what the gamelan does, but it is more than just a virtual sensation for the spectator. The continuous present is caused by the play between repetition and difference, forming a complex structure through the sounds that never becomes a unity, a whole, but is always changing. Difference is vital to it. Such a structure is exactly what Deleuze describes as a multiplicity: an ensemble or network without the necessity of unity to form such a system.⁴¹ The idea of multiplicities assumes that in these organisations, everything has its place and action, similar to Latour’s actor-network theory and in line with Bennett’s new materialistic ideas, in which is explained that prioritizing the human as only active

³⁸ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze’s Difference and Repetition*.

³⁹ Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

⁴⁰ Gertrude Stein et al., *The Letters of Gertrude Stein and Virgil Thomson: Composition as Conversation* (New York ; Oxford University Press, 2009).

⁴¹ Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

agent in a situation (in a multiplicity) limits the potential of thing-power.⁴² The theatre of the here and now is still described as a “centrally human practice”⁴³ or the “copresence of living beings”⁴⁴, while the soundscape in *Headroom*, by forming a continuous present through the use of repetition and difference, shows that theatre can emphasize a post-anthropocentric format.

After the gamelan section, the audience is shown interiors with and without actors in them, while the soundscape mimics the sounds made by the head of a person. Swallowing, breathing, the soft smacking of lips and the beating of the heart, but added to this is a low-volume sound of the wind and what sounds like the clinking of a teaspoon in a cup. Both the breath and the heart-beat, just like the lighting, add a rhythm and pattern to the performance. However, the sounds are recognizable, which means they are representations of these sounds in real life. This makes the dramaturgical choice harder to explore on the actual level because it results in a more dramatic aspect of the performance, as dramatic theatre is concerned mainly with forms of representation.⁴⁵ The spectator could imagine on a virtual level that we are inside someone’s head, and what we see on stage are representations of thoughts. This is a departure from other aspects of the performance that seem to play with and move away from the idea of representation, which will be discussed in later parts. The soundscape changes with the first interruption of the intensity of the light, to a wind-like sound, and from there onwards, sounds are added or taken away, of which some are recycled in other parts of the performance. This method of recycling is way to return to an earlier moment, a play with recognisability but also a play with the palimpsest. Recycling moves away from the original but also returns to it in the reality created by the performance. Returning is a process that plays with the idea of time and meaning,⁴⁶ which means that the repetition of music and lighting in *Headroom* were part of the continuous present and the idea of returning, showing that the notion of repetition and difference can play and redirect the ideas of beginnings, present, and endings.

Bodies and Objects

The aspects of the performance created through the use of repetition and difference in light and sound, as has been explained, have a tangible presence and agency over the performance, while not being as tangible as actual things. They are actants, just like the actual objects and bodies that are shown as tableaux vivants every time the light turns on. Bodies and objects are more easily

⁴² Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

⁴³ Ralf Remshardt, ‘Posthumanism’, in *Mapping Intermediality in Performance* (Amsterdam University Press, 2010), 135–39, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46mwjd.24>.

⁴⁴ Rebecca Schneider, ‘New Materialisms and Performance Studies’, *TDR/The Drama Review* 59, no. 4 (December 2015): 7–17, https://doi.org/10.1162/DRAM_a_00493.

⁴⁵ Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*.

⁴⁶ Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

conceived as things, as material, and the relationship between them is explored in *Headroom* through repetition and difference. The method of recycling and the idea of patterns comes forward prominently, as the interiors that are shown come back every now and then, and there is a limited amount of performers and objects that are shown to the audience that are recycled for various purposes in the performance. This is also where the performance balances on a tightrope of narrative and no-narrative, as these patterns seem to create narrative parts through, while the actual difference completely breaks through the often non-narrative relationship between the objects and bodies. It is repetition that establishes certain rules and boundaries, which, if there would be no difference, would result in a fixed state of everything.⁴⁷

An interesting play with the rules in the performance happens when one of the actors stands in one of the interiors while the light is on, but when the next tableaux appears it shows the same interior in which the body has been replaced with a kitchen ladder. The repetition emphasizes the one actual difference visible to the audience because everything else on stage is the 'same'. A set-up for narrative is created by the placement of the body in an interior, and a connection can be established. Is it the owner of the interior and thus the objects? When replaced by a ladder, the relation between the body and that ladder is one that draws them together on a more equal level. There is no ownership, and the object can appear as actual 'thing-in-itself', not as something necessarily connected to a human context but with its own "thing-power"⁴⁸, even though it is still discernible as something used by humans. The set-up for narrative is not completed and something different takes its place. The relation between object and body here is decided by the notion of repetition and difference, as both concepts play a part in the setting up and breaking of the narrative. Repetition of the interior and of the two 'things' placed in the exact same spot are both qualitative repetitions of equivalence between the repeated moments, which means these moments are visually replaceable with each other. The spectator is given these rules of repetition and is then expected to apply these rules to the other aspects of this part of the performance as well. So, when the replacement of the woman with the ladder is presented, the difference is clear and emphasized on by the majority of things being repeated, but the spectator might fit this difference into the rest of the picture, which is a repeated one. Virtually, the spectator can transform the difference into equality, which in this case would be seeing both as objects or both as bodies. In short, they might be seeing them as what they are on the actual level that DeLanda describes as the autonomous material world⁴⁹: both woman and ladder are material. Vital material even, as both influence the scene and the meaning-making of it. In this scene, the invisibility of routine is not made visible through

⁴⁷ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*.

⁴⁸ Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

⁴⁹ European Graduate School Video Lectures, *Manuel DeLanda. Deleuze and The New Materialism. 2009*.

enduring repetition, but through one clear difference. Eirini Kartsaki gave the example of sitting in a chair for a long time, which slowly starts to reveal how the body contorts to stay in that position, which is how repetition makes the routine visible.⁵⁰ I can give the example of sitting in a chair for a long time and, while suddenly moving just a bit, noticing that one leg has gone to sleep and is now fully numb, which is how difference made rules and routine of repetition visible in *Headroom*. In a later scene in the performance, two human actors stand opposite to each other, both accompanied by a drying rack. The light goes off-on and the individuals have been replaced by red buckets, a similar substitution as the scene described before, while the symmetry and composition of the quantitative repetition add another emphasis on the idea of equality between bodies and objects. Difference as a concept is impossible to define or find as something in itself, and here the concrete difference is in relation to what is placed on the stage before and after. The fact that difference is always in relation to something is seen as a problem by Deleuze, stating that it implies the negative (being different is often being subordinate to the norm, the *same*), which is exactly why *Repetition and Difference* became an exploration on separating this concept from what it represents.⁵¹ However, there are various reasons in favour of exploring difference in relation to something in contemporary theatre, specifically in *Headroom*. The two scenes described before put difference into relation with equation and equality in a somewhat paradoxical manner: There are two values (object and body) that are shown to be different and through the presence of repetition in other aspects on stage, these different values are equated exactly because they are different, resulting in both object and body as material equals, both as actants in a scene. Logically, this might sound nonsensical, but in a performance that is built to break down rules and routines as fast as they are built up, the assumed negativity of difference fades away because it is used to do the breaking of those rules. In this sense, the positive aspect of difference as a tool is confirmed by Deleuze, who is set to explore why difference and repetition matter in his book⁵², and some of that question has been unravelled through the analysis of the concept in *Headroom*.

It has been established that both repetition and difference separately and together can be considered dramaturgical tools for performance, which means that these concepts have the potential to influence a situation, that they are an agential actant in the compositions formed in *Headroom*. Composition is an integral part of the dramaturgy of a performance, as the dramaturgy is meant to keep aspects of the performance together and to shape the work⁵³, which can be explained as the conscious connections made within the composition of the things and concepts used in such a

⁵⁰ Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

⁵¹ Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

⁵² Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*.

⁵³ Turner and Behrndt, *Dramaturgy and Performance*.

performance. The word 'shape' connected to the dramaturgical practice can also be interpreted as the physical shape in which the composition is found and the virtual shape of the meaning-making created by the spectator, as any encounter with composition is uniquely experienced by the individuals encountering it, even when everyone looks at the same composition.⁵⁴ With this information, I connect repetition and difference within the composition of the performance to Deleuze & Guattari's ideas of assemblage, further explored by Manuel DeLanda in *Assemblage Theory*.⁵⁵ Where composition comes from the the Latin *componere*, meaning "to put together", certain contemporary definitions take it a step further by saying that in a composition, elements are put together to form "a whole",⁵⁶ but most often it is defined as using elements to arrange or form something, not specifying the whole. Assemblage, coming from French, is defined as the act of assembling or gathering or the state of being assembled,⁵⁷ which is a very similar definition to composition. DeLanda explains it as a multiplicity that forms a unity through the co-functioning of its elements, which means certain relations are established between all these elements within this multiplicity.⁵⁸ In *Headroom*, the event of the performance itself is an example of such an assemblage, as the dramaturgical composition on stage form relations, the audience forms relations with that what can be seen on stage and relations are established between audience members. In dramatic theatre, according to Lehmann, such relations within the audience would be emotional and mental (virtual), uniting them as a whole in their common thought.⁵⁹ However, in a performance such as *Headroom*, it is not a unity that arises, because the individual spectator's perspective is not one that can be generalised, which results in a heterogeneous community that might have similarities in thinking between small groups within it. This shows that the elements of difference and repetition are not only connected to what happens on stage, but also to the meaning-making of the audience.

A Compositional Assemblage

The audience is an assemblage, part of the bigger assemblage of the theatre event of the here and now, that forms relations that contain both repetition in their shared space and time and difference in their varying perspectives on the meaning and sensations of the performance.

As part of the bigger assemblage, the audience is not the only element that is causing the relations between everything in the assemblage, as all elements in a network like this have to be

⁵⁴ Turner and Behrndt.

⁵⁵ Manuel DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 1 online resource (x, 198 pages). vols, Speculative Realism (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), <http://public.eblib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=5011739>.

⁵⁶ 'Definition of Composition | Dictionary.Com', www.dictionary.com, accessed 29 July 2019, <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/composition>.

⁵⁷ 'Definition of ASSEMBLAGE', accessed 29 July 2019, <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/assemblage>.

⁵⁸ DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*.

⁵⁹ Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*.

considered actants. The connections between the objects and bodies on stage, explored in parts of this research before, are influenced by both of those elements within the composition, showing that theatre is not exclusively a performance of living beings using things, but that the new materialist idea of the thing leading or influencing the human is possible to portray and to imagine. Taking this into account, repetition and difference can be explored as one of the elements within the assemblage when considered a 'thing', a dramaturgical tool for the composition of the performance. According to DeLanda, it is important to see the properties of the assemblage not as fact without explanation, but as processes that are continuously being produced.⁶⁰ This reflects his idea of getting rid of essences by replacing them with processes to not get stuck on a transcendental plane⁶¹, meaning that in the case of the assemblage its properties can be explored on a level of actuality and concrete results. With this idea in mind, it can be said that certain properties are produced in *Headroom* through repetition which are then broken by difference. For example, around 50 minutes into the performance, the process of producing an interior every time the light turns on is broken by a new process in which there is a change in light, sound, and what is shown on stage. A series of objects are shown in a bright white light, too quickly to properly identify them, and after this series the performance *returns* to the interiors and the objects and humans within those interiors that the audience already recognises. It shows here that repetition and difference, as element of the assemblage, both build and break the composition. Turner and Behrndt claimed dramaturgy is meant to keep a performance together, but through the idea of the assemblage, dramaturgy and its tools is also meant to break the process of keeping together, constantly forming new processes. This means the assemblage continuously changes and never unites itself as a complete whole, reflecting the way the audience also does not form this whole but co-functions nonetheless, resulting in what DeLanda calls a "social assemblage".⁶²

The fact that the event of the performance is such a social assemblage, means that, even though this part of the research has tried to focus mainly on the actual aspects of *Headroom*, it is necessary to take into the account the sensations and perspectives produced by the spectator. The virtual seems to be inseparable from the actual, which has already come through in the research, as the actual processes created with the light and the music had to be put into relation to the sensations it might cause with the audience to be fully understood. The idea of anticipation and patterns that were explored through the use of repetition and difference, are both actual processes within the performance, but its effects were shown best when the spectator was considered. An insight into the relation between bodies and objects on stage was also given, showing that through repetition and

⁶⁰ DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*.

⁶¹ European Graduate School Video Lectures, *Manuel DeLanda. Deleuze and The New Materialism. 2009.*

⁶² DeLanda, *Assemblage Theory*.

difference the spectator was given a certain openness or awareness into the materiality of both 'things', which means both bodies and objects could be understood as equal. Here, the actuality of these aspects can only be referenced and explored by positioning it within the context of the spectator, within the virtual, showing once again that they are inherently connected. This is supported by the idea of the assemblage which assumes that all elements of the assemblage are put into relation with each other, connecting the virtual and actual in *Headroom*. In the end, this chapter was not about the actual in this performance and the next chapter will not be only about the virtual. It will, however, go into detail more strongly on the sensations and meaning-making of the audience that are caused by the use of repetition and difference, which will result in the exploration of the virtual more than in this chapter.

Chapter 3 – Effects of Repetition and Difference on the Audience

Sense-Making through Repetition and Difference

"The modern world is one of simulacra."⁶³ Deleuze mentions this in the first page of the preface to the book *Repetition and Difference* and it emphasizes that the world of today is lived primarily in the virtual, that identities are constructed in the minds of people, shaping exactly how lives are lived. However, this does not mean the actual world only exists in our minds, or that it only has value because we construct an idea of it in our personal simulacrum. The actual and virtual connect on a level so close, it is near impossible to separate them. After attempting this in the former part of the research, the impossibility of it was clear, but the attempt itself turned out to provide the research with interesting takes on the analysis of the performance, which has led to this part of the analysis. The connection of the actual and the virtual can be seen as a fusing between mind and material that causes the sensations I have been exploring. The bodily experience of these sensations are the visceral reactions described by Josephine Machon as (syn)aesthetics, aspects of a performance designed to activate the body to create meaning through sensations.⁶⁴ As the virtual concerns the experiences and meaning-making of humans, a connection will be drawn between the spectator of *Headroom* and the virtual, considering the cultural and personal context in which this performance could be experienced. Lehmann claims, for example, that in the expressive format of the arts, one

⁶³ Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

⁶⁴ Josephine Machon, *(Syn)Aesthetics: Redefining Visceral Performance* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&doc_number=017603164&line_number=0001&func_code=D B_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA.

aspect of a performance can be completely changed in meaning because of a different context.⁶⁵ A play that *repeats* twice in the same day, will always be *different*, and the audience has a large role in this difference. The dramaturg has to take the relation between that what is staged and the context, or as Turner and Behrndt call it, “the work and the real”, into account.⁶⁶ Next to that, the experience and sensations of the audience are aspects of the performance influenced by the context and the dramaturgical tools on stage. Taking repetition and difference as one of these tools, certain moments in the performance will be analysed by looking into ideas on sense-making and sensations which will unravel the ways repetition and difference influence the audience on a virtual level, and how that connects to the actual, to the material that is on stage.

Experiencing Vital Materiality on Stage

After the performance’s conclusion, there were two objects used during that virtually stayed with me, for which I gave the reason that they had been used often, returning in many scenes. These objects were: a white drying rack and a red bucket. Both were indeed recurring objects in the performance, but had a bigger impact on me than, for example, the objects that belonged to the four different interiors established at the beginning, objects that returned way more often than the bucket and the drying rack. So, aspects of repetition of these two objects had specific qualities that produced this experience. They caused a sensation on my body that seemed inexplicable, an experience that allowed me to sense without the mind being able to explain in words what it was. My body had become the “experiencing and interpreting agent of the performance.”⁶⁷ This feeling resulted in an attempt to unravel my own entry point into the sense-making that occurred with the objects, which brought me to Maaïke Bleeker’s text *Thinking No-One’s Thought*, in which she states that a performance differs from the usual context of the spectator, that their frame of reference basically has to be confronted and then recalibrated to relate and make sense of the work.⁶⁸ For *Headroom*, this proved to be very true through the dramaturgical structure developed to establish a completely different idea of a world, a different landscape, than the audience was used to in their daily lives. However, there were these entry points, these representations and references of things and moments that seemed understandable. This exactly is what Bleeker sees as the entry-point to a performance, as it gives the audience the perspective to relate to it, while also questioning this

⁶⁵ Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*.

⁶⁶ Turner and Behrndt, *Dramaturgy and Performance*.

⁶⁷ Machon, *(Syn)Aesthetics*.

⁶⁸ Maaïke Bleeker, ‘Thinking No-One’s Thought’, in *Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement*, ed. Pil Hansen and Darcey Callison, New World Choreographies (London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015), 67–83, https://doi.org/10.1057/978113733229_4.

relationship between what is seen and the spectator.⁶⁹ The knowledge available about the objects were the understanding of how to use them and what to use them for, and that knowledge was immediately added on to by the fact that both were not being used for their supposed purpose at all. There were moments of interaction, however, which were full of repetition and difference and brought me to the next steps of sense-making.

The interactions here, as part of the assemblage, were always between object and object or object and body, and these interactions would then form a relation with the spectator. The drying rack is first introduced in a scene where two individuals observe a sitting man, who is repetitively moving one of the parts of this rack up and down. This in itself is a perfect example of Bleeker's theory in practice: the entry point is the recognizable drying rack and someone using it, but the satisfaction of that narrative is never fulfilled because the movement is not a logical part of this setting and it only repeats. Both the repetition and 'foreign' nature of the movement cause it to become the centre point of the attention and of sense-making. The process occurring before the audience is not focused on the actual object and the knowledge we have or may acquire about it, but on the sensations it might bring. Sensations are, according to Deleuze, aspects of actual things that occur so these things gain "living significance" for us.⁷⁰ A 'thing with living significance' can be clearly connected to the concept of vital materiality, and through the audience's awareness of these sensations caused by the object and the repetition of it, they might also acquire exactly what is deemed important for new materialists: acquiring and inducing an openness towards vital materiality.⁷¹ The fact that the sense-making literally has to do with senses more than knowledge, is an explanation for the inexplicability of why these objects stayed with me, or for why Kartsaki experienced her own body so contorted while watching repeated movements.⁷² The difficulty with this explanation, however, is that it cannot explain what such an experience of sensations is, what it consists of. For both Bennett and Deleuze, it is more important to look at what things can *do* and to feel some-thing's significance before understanding what it is,⁷³ but a dramaturgical tool cannot be one without understanding what it is before experiencing what it can do. If something is added to the dramaturgy without necessarily knowing its purpose, it can just as well be considered an accident, and its meaning does not have a lot of value. This is one of the reasons for this research, as it delves into the concept of repetition and difference to understand its worth as dramaturgical tool by understanding both what it can do and what it is. Repetition has been shown to be part of the

⁶⁹ Bleeker.

⁷⁰ Deleuze and Bacon, *Francis Bacon*.

⁷¹ Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

⁷² Kartsaki, *Repetition in Performance*.

⁷³ Bennett, *Vibrant Matter*.

⁷⁴ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*.

assemblage that creates the sensations for the audience in the first scene with the drying rack. Difference is also part of it, but not as clearly, and another scene can serve as an entry point in the understanding of what it does in both scenes. When the light turns on, there are no human actors on stage, but a sculpture-like structure is created as five drying racks can be seen on top of each other, just balanced enough to not fall (or so it seems) while the structure is visibly shaking from its instability. While the object itself is repeated from one scene to another and in this scene itself, as the object is present five times on stage, the differences of its use are what stands out this time. In the scenes before, a visible contrast was created between human actors and objects through stillness and movement. Every human on stage would perform subtle movements, as if breathing very clearly with the body, or how an avatar in a game is shown continuously moving its body when standing 'still'. The objects, however, would take a place in the lit-up space and would then be completely still, something a human physically cannot do until death. It is only because of a human actor that the drying rack moves in the scene explored before, but with the wobbling structure in this scene, the material once again shows its agency and is given similar properties to the human bodies shown in this performance, playing with the equalizing of human bodies and objects as *Headroom* does in other parts as well. It is the seeming instability caused by the moving structure that impacts the spectator's sensations, as the difference from stillness to movement provides a different idea of what the objects do and because of that, their vital materiality is emphasized. Deleuze calls this "sensual variations and the variations in ideas", which are the aspects of the virtual that give things their power in our minds.⁷⁵ The variation here seems to be a direct effect of repetition and difference, through the relations of objects and bodies, as the object goes from stillness to movement. Another aspect of the drying rack sculpture that is rooted within difference is, just like the dissatisfying use of the drying rack in the previous scene, the inexplicability of what the purpose of this sculpture is. What is expected by the audience is, first of all, the conventional use of drying racks, which has already been denied by the repetitive useless movement of it in the scene before this. This, as Bleeker has explained, might have helped the audience to confront their usual knowledge of understanding and so they might expect the breaking of conventions.⁷⁶ It is exactly what they get, with less subtlety and more spectacle, a stronger presence because of the wobbling sculpture, which makes the difference from conventional use stronger as well. It is the breaking of these conventions that makes difference a strong dramaturgical tool in this case, as the expectations of the audience now might have been satisfied, while they are still being shown something that is not exactly comprehensible. Where Deleuze saw difference in relation to something as a negative

⁷⁵ Deleuze and Bacon, *Francis Bacon*.

⁷⁶ Bleeker, 'Thinking No-One's Thought'.

process, in this performance the relation between conventions and the audience is unravelled, resulting in a more positive use of this process: the process of becoming something else, as the drying rack becomes the sculpture and the audience becomes someone else through the variations in their ideas caused by this scene. Rosa Braidotti relates Deleuze's ideas about difference to otherness and becoming as well, as an empowering tool for people to understand and be moved by each other, and by things.⁷⁷

In certain parts, which I have jokingly started calling "the mysterious case of the red bucket", repetition and difference is used in a similar way, but through a different dramaturgical structure that then results in a different relationship between the object and other things on stage, especially human bodies. This red bucket was already part of the analysis before, showing that through repetition and difference, things can be equated as materials and then possibly also considered equal by the spectator. Through the most part of the performance, this object is seen a couple more times, and is never touched or interacted with by the other performers, contrary to the drying rack. Then, after nearly an hour of performance, the light turns on and a man is sitting in far-left corner of the square, surrounded by a half-circle of five buckets. In a scene after that, a man stands next to ten buckets, fitted on top of each other to form what looks like a totem pole of red buckets. For both moments, there are more than one bucket on stage, which means that there is a quantitative repetition in both scenes described before is a repetition visible in one moment. The five and the ten buckets are all continuous repetitions of each other and because of this similarity and repetition in those two scene, their physical presence is easily put together as one entity by the audience, as humans tend to focus on possible continuities that can be understood as patterns, or as unities.⁷⁸ So it seems possible that the object then acquires a stronger presence and a stronger force on the audience, but it is not only the object that influences the spectator in these scenes, as a human actor is on stage both moments.

Problematic Representation

According to Cormac Power, there is a possibility of disrupting the presence of the fictional world that has been created by a performance, by including too many elements that are naturalistic or representative of the real world.⁷⁹ When giving the audience many of these references as points of entry in a performance like *Headroom*, they will not generate meaning as much as they will create a distraction to the physical presence of what is on stage. This research has found that the moments created through repetition and difference are meant to give the spectator the possibility to

⁷⁷ Van der Tuin and Dolphijn, *New Materialism*.

⁷⁸ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*.

⁷⁹ Power, *Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre*.

experience and express intensities and sensations, but it is explained by Williams in a critical introduction to Deleuze's *Repetition and Difference* that we experience much more than we are conscious of, way more than we can capture in these references and representations. An individual is more on both an actual and virtual level than our minds are capable of representing.⁸⁰ In the scene where a man stands next to the tower of buckets, the relation that is created is one of being in the same space, considering the buckets together as one actant in the assemblage. It is a feeling of presence of both 'beings' that is projected onto the audience. One factor that supports this non-representative way of showing something is the way the actor behaves, as he moves in that peculiar way described before, but does not interact with the object next to him at all, he does not even look at it. Because of this, the relation between both materials is just one of their presence, their togetherness. Contrary to this scene, when the man is seated on a chair surrounded by five buckets, he performs certain movements that can be taken as entry points to representative meaning for the audience. With his hands on his knees, he seems to notice the objects, looks at them, looks away, tightens his grip on his knees, and then looks again. This sequence of actions can be taken by the spectator as signs of threat, confusion, panic, which focuses their sense-making on a more dramatic narrative that is not fulfilled in later scenes. The actual force of the objects on stage are put into a different relation with the actor, destroying its power as 'thing'. However, it can also be said that through this scene, the spectator views the objects as actants causing the emotions of the human actor, which means their thing-power does come forward, emphasizing the post-anthropocentric idea of agential matter.

Another example of a scene in *Headroom* that I initially felt did not fit within the rest of the landscape, even though it was incorporating elements of repetition and difference, can be considered the final scene of the performance. In the final three minutes, five people are shown, lying in different positions, some with obvious bloodstains or ripped clothes, all seemingly deceased. The light turns off and when it turns on the audience sees something for the first time: a completely empty square, which then disappears again to bring the performance to an end. The repetition is one of similarities, as the spectator can distinguish five different characters, who all have suffered the same repeated fate. However, repetition in this case does something else than triggering sensations with the audience, as anticipation is created with every dead character that appears shortly before the performance is over. In the description of the work on Theater Rotterdam's website, it states that the makers "cherish the state of not knowing", creating a tension through building apparent narratives and breaking them down, which is also shown in this last scene.⁸¹ However, the fact that

⁸⁰ Williams, *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition*.

⁸¹ Pepered, 'Headroom | Theater Rotterdam', accessed 6 August 2019, http://www.theaterrotterdam.nl/agenda/6411/Theater_Rotterdam/Headroom/.

the performance ends right then and there, breaks this tension in such a way that it might not have the wished effect. On top of that, because this scene is so referential to the 'real', the spectator's focus is too involved with trying to understand or create the meaning that any sensations that have been found to be possible to trigger through the dramaturgical tool of repetition and difference, are lost. The final scene is an important one, as it is an image the audience will have very visibly in their minds while exiting from the fictional to reality, and in *Headroom* it is used as such that it moves away from that what has been gained through repetition and difference on the virtual level of sensations and the actual level of vital materiality, making it once again difficult for the audience to put humans and objects on an equal level.

Through a deeper analysis of the virtual and actual in this performance, repetition and difference has shown itself as potential dramaturgical tool to explore the ideas new materialism, especially the idea of agential matter and vital materiality, as objects in *Headroom* were put on an equal level with the human actors present on stage. This does mean the spectator has to actively view, redefining their ideas and conventions, to experience the sensations that the objects can trigger and to relate the performance to their daily lives. That objects can trigger these sensations in a performance like this, is a great example of the potential of repetition and difference as tool to create an awareness of vital materiality. However, there were also moments where repetition and difference was used to create certain narratives, although mostly subtle, causing a disruption within the experience of this performance. This happened mainly because of the difficulty of the presence of the human actor, who still seems to be more significant than any object on stage when put in a more dramatic setting. Like any tool, repetition and difference has to be used within the right context and format to be able to convey the ideas of new materialism, but theatre and performance are not the only formats in which this tool is used, as it is explored in both writing and cinema as well. The next part of the research will compare these explorations to the findings of the analysis, to find if there are specific qualities of performance that are vital to explore new materialist thought through repetition and difference.

Chapter 4 – Repetition in other Media Formats

Repetition in Film

“The villain’s theme”. Many famous films which narratives rely on the performance of an extraordinary clever or evil villain include such a theme in the score: the *Gozer Theme* from *Ghostbusters*, *Imperial March* in *Star Wars*, and maybe the most well-known *Jaws Theme* from Steven Spielberg’s *Jaws*. In this film, the recognizable theme provides structure in the narrative for the viewer, as it is soon understood that the great white shark is coming whenever the theme starts playing. The repetition of theme is used to identify what is happening or what is going to happen, something Deleuze describes as the setting of boundaries to provide this structure, which we do in our daily lives constantly.⁸² In this case, the theme is similar to the use of theatrical signs in dramatic theatre and different than the purpose of repetition in the soundscape in *Headroom*. The performance does have identifiable sounds that can be recognized by the audience, but are not repeated to signify a new scene, or a specific character. As has come forward in the analysis, the repetition and difference play with blurred lines of beginnings and endings and create a continuous present. In post-dramatic theatre like this, if the audience still searches for representative signs, they will end up with dramatic and unintended meaning.⁸³ Something both music scores do, however, is creating the feeling of anticipation with the audience. Using repeated sounds for a longer time evokes the sensation that something is about to happen, that something significant will change. With the *Jaws* theme, someone either is or is not going to get killed, and the audience is left to anticipate which one of the two options it is going to be. Anticipation in film and the fulfilling of that anticipation is another recognizable structure for the audience that causes tension but also comfort, as it is a pattern that humans tend to look for. The anticipation that is evoked in *Headroom* is never satisfied and at the end of the performance the spectator might feel like they are released more than relieved. These sensations of uneasiness through the use of repetition and difference are not done in traditional cinema because films rely on dramatic plot to satisfy the viewer who will create meaning and form their own opinions in relation to it.

Recognizability and symbolism in narrative film through the repeated use of objects are created in a similar way as musical themes, as characters are appointed things that are of value because of the specific qualities they possess. For example, the character Mary Poppins owns a talking umbrella that allows her to fly and so, whenever this umbrella is opened, the audience is given a sign for what is going to happen next. Next to that, a symbolism can also be given to an

⁸² Deleuze and Patton, *Difference and Repetition*.

⁸³ Lehmann, *Postdramatic Theatre*.

object in the film, which provides an entry point for the viewer to make sense of the scene or plot through the symbol that object gives every time it is repeated on screen. Such a repeated symbol is called a *Leit Motif* and can also be created through other elements of film like lighting, framing, colours, text, and more. Symbolism can be projected onto a film by the audience without the intention of the filmmaker, just as the unconscious choices in the dramaturgy of a performance can create meaning for the viewer. However, where repetition in traditional cinema is used to define a clear framework within the story takes place, *Headroom* incorporates repetition and difference to set up the assemblage of the performance which can lead to different interpretations and sensations for every individual watching. Maaïke Bleeker recognizes this dramaturgical strategy in which the audience is left to wander while presented with various tracks on which to walk, all of which in relation to each other.⁸⁴ This is a quality of contemporary theatre that is vital for the idea of (syn)aesthetic performance in which the sensations and the visceral reactions of the audience are what influence the sense-making of the work. Repetition and difference has been found to be a useful dramaturgical tool to allow those sensations to be triggered in *Headroom*, while the traditional narrative structure has been completely let go of. This is not a quality necessarily specific to performance, as filmmakers in experimental cinema also often let go of the idea of narrative to focus on the potentiality of the structure of film.⁸⁵ Such explorations can be done with repetition, shows Daniel Barnett, as a filmmaker can play one scene over and over again in a film to make the audience aware that the film is presenting a new language, a new structure, and that narrative is out of the picture.⁸⁶ This new structure then has to be explored and eventually accepted by the viewer, similar to the Bleeker's idea of recalibration of the audience's usual conventions. In *Headroom*, the use of lighting that has been analysed in this research is a good example of the proposition of a new structure for that fictional world, through the repetition it is emphasized what is demanded from the audience in how they perceive. However, Barnett describes repetition as a way for triggering hypnotic or trance-like states with the audience, which is a more transcendental description than what was found to be actual thing-power that could be sensed by the audience through the use of repetition and difference. It is possible that a physical force is not thought of in the analysis of film, as the medium has less of a clear presence as the viewer is not sharing the space with actual objects and performers, but is watching a screen on which those actants are projected. The materiality of film however, Barnett claims, and the repetition of the material used is essential to cinema. When holding a strip of film in your hands, every small picture that follows the one before seems nearly the

⁸⁴ Maaïke Bleeker, 'Dramaturgy as a Mode of Looking', *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 13, no. 2 (January 2003): 163–72, <https://doi.org/10.1080/07407700308571432>.

⁸⁵ Daniel Barnett, *Movement as Meaning: In Experimental Film* (Amsterdam, NETHERLANDS, THE: BRILL, 2008), <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=556529>.

⁸⁶ Barnett.

same as every still-frame only captures a short amount of time.⁸⁷ The images are repeated and in that repetition, difference is what slowly progresses these images to form others. It is static as the material itself but dynamic on the screen, which is exactly how experimental cinema can focus on the structure behind film: an emphasis on the materials that make watching a film possible could show the audience that they are not necessarily being influenced by narrative, but also by physical things that have agency over them.

Repetition in Beckett's Literature and Theatre

Just as the medium of film incorporates repetition in the various ways that have been discussed, certain writers in literature have made use of this tool as well. Gertrude Stein has already been mentioned in this research, someone who experimented with text and repetition, but I will here focus on Samuel Beckett, who used the concept of repetition in his texts, both in his books and in the theatre plays he wrote.⁸⁸ Taking his texts as examples to compare with *Headroom*, it might be possible to provide insight in both literature and textual theatre and how the use of repetition in those media is similar or different to the use in performance. Steven Connor writes that it is logical for Beckett's work to have explored the use of repetition, as it is a necessary concept for understanding human identity and Beckett focused on being, identity, and representation.⁸⁹ An obvious difference with *Headroom* and his texts is in fact the text itself. *Headroom* includes no spoken text except for a song in the soundscape at the end of the performance, while Beckett's works are all written text, as books or for the stage. This means that the repetitions are always textual and linguistic, as he uses repetition as a similarity in which two characters can have a similar name and go through similar narrative, so the reader will explore the relation between these two characters.⁹⁰ Beckett follows the postmodern idea of recirculating the known through repetition of his own texts, exploring the relationship between originality and repetition, which *Headroom* does without text. The performance creates its own 'original' by providing the audience the interiors, after which it starts repeating these interiors, adding onto them, removing from them, creating differences and similarities. In comparison, Connor describes that Beckett's last book basically consisted of citations of his own earlier works, as a reimagined collection of his originality.⁹¹ Both performance and literature seem fit for the exploration of the old as a way to reinvent and to recalibrate knowledge to give the viewers or readers a new way of looking through the repetition. However, as

⁸⁷ Barnett.

⁸⁸ Steven Connor, *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory, and Text* (Aurora, UNITED STATES: The Davies Group, Publishers, 2006), <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=3138972>.

⁸⁹ Connor.

⁹⁰ Connor.

⁹¹ Connor.

Beckett moved from literature to theatre, the relationship between text and repetition changed, as he moved away from the script as the most important part of theatre, calling it “an escape from the compulsion to repeat.”⁹² The written text is empty by itself, the performance is what has the power, which is similar to Artaud’s idea about a theatre of pure presence which he claimed could only happen if it moved away from repetition.⁹³ In a way, Beckett’s writing moved from repetition of writing itself, to a repetition within the actions and moments in the scripts he wrote, which he did to emphasize the presence of the stage and that what is on it.⁹⁴ For example, in *Waiting for Godot*, one of the most well-known works of theatre ever, both Estragon and Vladimir are present on stage, waiting, until a boy shows up telling them that Godot will not come. They repeat this the next day, and again nothing happens. It is as if they are stuck in a loop without beginning or ending, similar to how in *Headroom* the light and the sound is repeated to give that sensation. The concept of presence on stage can be emphasized through repetition of what is on stage, as found in this research, and that quality seems possible for both textual and more visual theatre. The means through which repetition can be used as a dramaturgical tool will of course differ when working with text or not, which is why such a tool always needs to be handled with care and knowledge of context.

The media of film, literature, and textual theatre all share potential in using repetition and difference to explore or emphasize certain aspects that have to do with their structure. Traditional cinema, theatre, and literature often rely on the repetition of original texts and the repetition of motifs and themes to allow the viewer or reader to follow the narrative. Textual theatre that is more postmodern, like Beckett’s work, uses repetition to emphasize presence, not narrative, similar to *Headroom*. The materiality of what is present, however, does not seem to be a focus in this case, while in the medium of film it is recognized that the materiality of the equipment (thing-power) and the structure behind how films are made can be emphasized through repetition and difference. Such materiality is something that comes forward in *Headroom*, although this performance is more concerned with the vital materiality of what is on stage than the laying bare the structure behind it. Moreover, the quality of the shared space in theatre in combination with a focus on materiality seems to be a specific quality that comes forward through the use of repetition and difference, as both literature and films do not have this quality of the here and now, and repetition in textual theatre focuses on presence, not on materiality.

⁹² Connor.

⁹³ Antonin Artaud, *The Theatre and Its Double* (Oneworld Classics, 2010).

⁹⁴ Connor, *Samuel Beckett*.

Conclusion

Contemporary theatre and performance has the specific quality of being together in the here and now, audience and performers together, and repetition is one of the dramaturgical tools that can be used in this space of togetherness. Rediscovering this concept already known in performance through a more philosophical approach has proven to work as the contextual and theoretical base of Deleuze's ideas and new materialism added a fresh meaning to the concept and helped the research explore how it could affect the audience. Repetition *and* difference, which is inherently attached to it, can allow the spectator to focus on detail and structure of movement and works as a tool of experiencing and sensations, not as a signifier or tool for representation. On top of that, repetition can evoke the idea of returning to something known and then play with this knowledge, breaking the conventions of the spectator, forcing some kind of recalibration of their thoughts. So, repetition as a dramaturgical tool works beyond representation, with a focus on what is present on stage and how what is present can be reimagined. As Cormac Power has shown, such presence is not about the auratic or spiritual, but about the actual and physical, the repetition of material things that cause a literal presence. According to Deleuze, the world is made up out of the actual and the virtual, in which the actual is the autonomous material world, described also in new materialist texts, and the virtual is the meaning and context we adhere to this material world. Taking this as truth, it means vital materiality and thing-power are real, things have agency and can affect people and so they can also affect a theatre audience. In the analysis of *Headroom*, I attempted separating the actual and the virtual to be able to focus on both concepts in detail, but found it was impossible, as the actual is directly connected to the virtual ideas we attach to it and in a performance analysis the audience and its interpretations are vital. This meant that in this research, the actual and virtual were never really separated, and their connection could be an important part in research on the connection between sense-making and what can be seen on stage.

The first part of the analysis focused on light and the soundscape, which were both two major components of sense-making in this performance. The repetition of light and dark showed that there is always a gap, a rupture between two repetitions, which in this case was the darkness. This interruption can be seen as the difference that exists within repetition, emphasizing the power of light and dark towards the audience. Difference in the intensity of lighting, or colours, would activate the audience as it moves away from the conventional pattern of repetition, and when the lighting would go back to that pattern, the idea of returning was evoked. It are the interruptions in repetition that emphasize that difference is an agential factor in it, while also shedding a light on the patterns that repetition can create. In the first five minutes of the soundscape, difference was also an integral part of repetition, as a continuous present was created by repeated sounds that would slowly go through differences. Deleuze describes this idea as a multiplicity, something that never becomes a

unity and is ever-changing, but its components all have an effect on the situation. Through the idea of the multiplicity, the sound becomes an agential actor in the performance, just like the lighting. However, the recognizably human sounds like the swallowing and breathing in the soundscape were too representative even in their repetition, taking the focus away from the thing-power of the sound. The analysis of lighting and sound showed that repetition and difference can play with the concept of time and the present, while the interruptions in lighting and the repetition in sound emphasized the agency of light and sound as actants in the performance, as things that have a physical effect on the audience while not necessarily being actual objects with a tangible presence.

A more tangible presence was found in the analysis of bodies and objects in *Headroom*, as repetition and the interruption of difference caused bodies and objects to be put on more equal levels as agential material, emphasizing the vital materiality of both. The tendency of humans to follow routines and patterns were made visible, but not, like Kartsaki explained, through continuous repetition, but through sudden differences, which would interrupt routine and make the audience aware of what that routine was. This showed as well that difference as a concept in relation to other things on stage is not necessarily a negative relation as Deleuze claims, as difference can be used to make the audience aware of their conventions and then help them redefine them, with the potential to be more open towards vital materiality. On top of this, the composition of bodies, objects, light, sound, and everything in the performance should be considered as an assemblage, in which every element is an actant that has an influence on the event and the experience of it. This once again confirms that the actual on stage is directly connected to the virtual sense-making of the audience. Sense-making is influenced by the existing knowledge and context of each individual audience member, but also concerns sensations, as the presence of something on stage can produce a physical force which then form virtual significance through the spectator. In *Headroom*, repetition and difference is shown to be capable of causing these sensations, as the audience enters the experience with their conventions which are then broken by the use of this dramaturgical tool. This is also why representation does not work in this performance, as the focus is put on forming some kind of narrative, moving away from the physical sensations and the possible awareness towards vital materiality.

Through the comparison with other media it was found that repetition is present in both literature and traditional cinema to support narrative and structure, to provide the rules and boundaries for the audience. Experimental film uses repetition more to explore the structure of film itself, while I found that the materiality of the medium of film is a well-known topic that could be explored through the use of repetition and difference. However, the fact that the audience watches it on a flat screen negates the presence and togetherness of the theatre space, which was found to be of vital importance to convince an audience of the agential powers of things. This is why

repetition in Beckett's textual theatre, for example, is capable of emphasizing purely on presence of what is on stage, but focuses more on humans than objects as the text leads the audience towards this. In general, the 'abilities' of repetition and difference in *Headroom* have revealed its potential as a dramaturgical tool, specifically focused on presence of materials on stage, which can influence the audience to become more aware of thing-power, vital materiality, and the fact that we live in a material world. However, it was also shown that repetition and difference works like this in a specific context, something the dramaturg always has to consider. Using repetition and difference does not equate new materialist thought, but it can touch upon this subject in the specific context analysed in this research. Through further exploration of vital materiality and the importance of thinking post-anthropocentric, repetition and difference might show even more aspects that can support these ideas in theatre and performance.

Bibliography

- Artaud, Antonin. *The Theatre and Its Double*. Oneworld Classics, 2010.
- Barnett, Daniel. *Movement as Meaning: In Experimental Film*. Amsterdam, NETHERLANDS, THE: BRILL, 2008. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=556529>.
- Bauer, Bojana. 'Propensity: Pragmatics and Functions of Dramaturgy in Contemporary Dance'. In *Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement*, edited by Pil Hansen and Darcey Callison, 31–50. New World Choreographies. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137373229_2.
- Bennett, Jane. *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010. <http://www.dawsonera.com/depp/reader/protected/external/AbstractView/S9780822391623>.
- Bergson, Henri. *Time and Free Will: An Essay on the Immediate Data of Consciousness*. Courier Corporation, 2012.
- Bleeker, Maaïke. 'Dramaturgy as a Mode of Looking'. *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 13, no. 2 (January 2003): 163–72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07407700308571432>.
- . 'Thinking No-One's Thought'. In *Dance Dramaturgy: Modes of Agency, Awareness and Engagement*, edited by Pil Hansen and Darcey Callison, 67–83. New World Choreographies. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137373229_4.
- Campenhout, Elke van, and Lilia Mestre. *Turn, Turtle!: Reenacting The Institute*. Alexander Verlag Berlin, 2016.
- Connor, Steven. *Samuel Beckett: Repetition, Theory, and Text*. Aurora, UNITED STATES: The Davies Group, Publishers, 2006. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=3138972>.

- 'Definition of ASSEMBLAGE'. Accessed 29 July 2019. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/assemblage>.
- 'Definition of Composition | Dictionary.Com'. www.dictionary.com. Accessed 29 July 2019. <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/composition>.
- DeLanda, Manuel. *Assemblage Theory*. 1 online resource (x, 198 pages). vols. Speculative Realism. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016. <http://public.ebib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=5011739>.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Francis Bacon. *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*. London; New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Paul Patton. *Difference and Repetition*. London: Athlone Press, 1994.
- 'DYING TOGETHER'. *Third Space* (blog). Accessed 16 July 2019. <https://www.thirdspace.nl/werk/dying-together/>.
- European Graduate School Video Lectures. *Manuel DeLanda. Deleuze and The New Materialism. 2009*. Accessed 13 November 2018. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EcqRGy9T32c>.
- Georgelou, Konstantina. NITE interdisciplinary event. Panel discussion, 25 April 2019.
- Georgelou, Konstantina, Efrosini Protopapa, and Danae Theodoridou. *The Practice of Dramaturgy: Working on Actions in Performance*. Arts in Society. Amsterdam: Valiz, 2017.
- Kartsaki, Eirini. *Repetition in Performance: Returns and Invisible Forces*. 1 online resource : illustrations vols. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2017. <http://public.ebib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=4984143>.
- Latour, Bruno. *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford, UNITED KINGDOM: Oxford University Press USA - OSO, 2005. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=422646>.
- Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre*, 2006.
- Machon, Josephine. *(Syn)Aesthetics: Redefining Visceral Performance*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&doc_number=017603164&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA.
- Madonna. *Material Girl*. 1984. Song.
- Peppered. 'Headroom | Theater Rotterdam'. Accessed 6 August 2019. http://www.theaterrotterdam.nl/agenda/6411/Theater_Rotterdam/Headroom/.
- Power, Cormac. *Presence in Play: A Critique of Theories of Presence in the Theatre*. New York: Rodolpi, 2008.
- Remshardt, Ralf. 'Posthumanism'. In *Mapping Intermediality in Performance*, 135–39. Amsterdam University Press, 2010. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46mwjd.24>.

'Repetition | Definition of Repetition by Merriam-Webster'. Accessed 14 July 2019.

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/repetition>.

Schneider, Rebecca. 'New Materialisms and Performance Studies'. *TDR/The Drama Review* 59, no. 4 (December 2015): 7–17. https://doi.org/10.1162/DRAM_a_00493.

Stein, Gertrude, Virgil Thomson, Thomas. Dilworth, and Susan Holbrook. *The Letters of Gertrude Stein and Virgil Thomson: Composition as Conversation*. New York ; Oxford University Press, 2009.

Turner, Cathy, and Synne K. Behrndt. *Dramaturgy and Performance*. Revised edition. Theatre and Performance Practices. London: Palgrave, 2016.

Van der Tuin, Iris, and Rick Dolphijn. *New Materialism: Interviews & Cartographies*. Open Humanities Press, 2012.

Williams, James. *Gilles Deleuze's Difference and Repetition: A Critical Introduction and Guide*. Edinburgh, UNITED KINGDOM: Edinburgh University Press, 2013.

<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/uunl/detail.action?docID=1126583>.

Media List

Arribas, Esther, and Anthony Nestel. *All Things Want To Run* (2019), Performance.

Beckett, Samuel. *Waiting For Godot* (1953), Theatre.

Boogaerdt/Vanderschoot and Erik Whien. *Headroom* (2018), 13 September 2018, Theatre.

Perna, Moreno. *Aura* (2019), Dance.

Spielberg, Steven. *Jaws* (1975), Film.

Van den Berg, Lotte. *Dying Together* (2018), Performance.

Warlop, Miet. *Ghost Writer and the Broken Hand Break* (2019), Performance.